



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/221,539	12/28/1998	W.C. CHENG	1010-1	4444

7590 03/13/2003

RONALD A. BLEEKER, ESQ.
MOBIL OIL CORPORATION, OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL
3225 GALLOWS ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
FAIRFAX, VA 22037

EXAMINER

NORTON, NADINE GEORGIANNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1764

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

27

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-27

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/221,539	CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nadine Norton	1764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on 1-13-03 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 26 and 27 contain the phrase "at least one metal selected from the group alumina, silica-alumina, clay and mixtures thereof". Since alumina, silica-alumina, clay and mixtures thereof do not fit into the category of "metals", it is unclear if applicants had intended to define specific metals to further limit the claims.

Withdrawal of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants' amendments/arguments filed 1-13-03 in paper no.26 are sufficient to overcome all the previous rejections over primary references Beck et al.(4,588,702) or Kugler (4,944,864) alone or in combination with secondary references.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 6, and 8-12 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 8 and 11-14 of copending Application No. 09/468,452. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to a method of reducing the sulfur content of a catalytically cracked petroleum fraction.

A difference is noted between the present claims and the claims of application No. 09/468,452. Applicants' claims define a rare earth metal component whereas the claims of Application No. 09/468,452 define a cerium component.

Art Unit: 1764

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select any rare earth metal in applicants' claims, including cerium, because the present claims do not exclude the use of any rare earth metal.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 12 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 10-14 of copending Application No. 09/144,607 in view of Beck et al.(4,588,702).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to a process for reducing the sulfur content of a catalytically cracked petroleum feed fraction in the presence of a cracking catalyst and a product sulfur reduction catalyst.

A difference is noted between the present claims and the claims of Application No. 09/144,607. Claim 1 of Application No.09/144,607 does not include an additional rare earth component as defined in applicants' claim 1.

The reference of Beck et al.(4,588,702) teaches that rare earth components are known promoters in catalytic cracking processes. See column 9, lines 30-35 and column 10, lines 49-55.

Art Unit: 1764

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an additional rare earth component in the claims of 09/144,607 because Beck et al.(4,588,702) illustrates that rare earths are known promoters in catalytic cracking.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 12 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over copending Application No. 09/144,607 which has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the copending application, it would constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) if published or patented. This provisional rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is based upon a presumption of future publication or patenting of the conflicting application 09/144,607.

See reasons for obviousness in double patenting rejection above.

This provisional rejection might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the copending application was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by a showing of a date of invention for the instant application prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the copending application under 37 CFR 1.131. For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

• Art Unit: 1764

Response to Arguments

The previous Double Patenting rejection over U.S. Application No. 09/221,540 is withdrawn because the application has become abandoned.

Applicants' arguments are persuasive with respect to the fact that the previously applied art does not suggest employing the combination of a product sulfur reduction catalyst containing vanadium and an "equilibrium" catalyst as claimed by applicants to remove sulfur from a cracked liquid product.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadine Norton whose telephone number is 703-305-2667. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 am to 7:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola be reached on 703-308-6824. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0661.

N.N.

March 6, 2003

NADINE G. NORTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

